



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

stood on an equality with his neighbor, aid in the development of a democracy, and become, to some extent at least, the source of the political activity of the town meeting? Did not the independent spirit of the different congregations serve to cultivate that jealousy of central institutions which finally made America independent? These questions deserve at least thoughtful consideration before we accept Mr. Adams's conclusion.

Finally, how have Massachusetts historians interpreted the record? Mr. Adams thinks that

we, in the matter of historical work, are yet in the filio-pietistic and patriotic stage of development. "Ancestor worship" is the rule, and an excellent illustration of the results to which that worship leads those given to it is afforded in the treatment which has been accorded to that portion of the Massachusetts record which relates to religious toleration. It is not too much to say that the resources of sophistry and special pleading have been exhausted in the attempt to extenuate it or explain it away.

He objects in the strongest terms to any laudation of the Massachusetts leaders by those who would load Philip II with execrations for acting upon the same motives. On the whole, not the least valuable feature of Mr. Adams's work is its vigorous protest against the all-prevalent ultra-provincial treatment of Massachusetts history.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE.

LESTER G. BUGBEE.

Les Ministres dans les Principaux Pays d'Europe et d'Amérique.

By L. DUPRIEZ. Two volumes. Paris, J. Rothschild, 1893. — xvi, 548, viii, 544 pp.

This work received the Odilon-Barrot prize, awarded by the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences for the best monograph on the rôle of ministers in modern states. The author is professor at the University of Louvain, Belgium. He has treated his subject rather from the point of view of the lawyer than from that of the politician. At the same time, he has had enough of the instinct of the statesman and student of political science, to see the importance of going beyond the mere text of the laws, of studying those usages and customs which supplement and modify them, and especially of considering the results of the party organization in the various countries.

The author classifies the governments studied into (1) constitutional monarchies, which he treats in Volume I, embracing Great Britain, Belgium, Italy, Prussia and the German Empire, and (2)

republics, which he treats in the second volume, embracing the United States in its federal organization, Switzerland and France. As is quite natural in view of the fact that the monograph was submitted to a French jury, he treats most fully of the institutions of France, devoting to them more than half of one volume.

M. Dupriez's classification, while a perfectly obvious one, is, at the same time, hardly the most scientific that might have been adopted. At the present time, the governments of states are differentiated rather according to the relation of the executive to the other branches of the government than from the point of view of the hereditary or non-hereditary character of the executive. The author recognizes this fact in the concluding remarks which are appended to the second volume, where he says that the nature of the rôle played by ministers depends very little upon the form of the government. And in these concluding remarks he adopts a much more scientific classification, including in his first class only the United States, where the principle of the separation of powers has been most powerful, and in his second class, the Prussian and German constitutions, where the powers of government are distinguished, it is true, but not so thoroughly, and where the royal power is preponderant. This latter class he calls personal government. In his third class he includes those countries which have adopted parliamentary government, that is, a system where no emphasis has been laid upon the separation of powers, and in which the parliament, rather than the crown, is the preponderant power. The government of England is the type of this class, and under it are included also France, Belgium and Italy. In his fourth class, he places the constitutions whose type is Switzerland, where the powers of government are completely confused. This classification seems to be one of the most valuable features of the work, and it is to be regretted that more emphasis is not laid upon it. Had it been made the basis of the work; had the treatment of the various countries been made in accordance with it: a far greater impression would have been made upon the mind of the reader.

M. Dupriez has, however, in the classification which he has adopted, treated the subject with great thoroughness; indeed, he has gone, in some cases, quite far afield, and has embraced, not only the rôle of the ministers, but also, with a clear sense of what is necessary to an adequate comprehension of their powers, a sketch of the entire system of administration. He thus treats in all cases of the relations of the central administration to the various

localities, and gives, for the space which it occupies, a most satisfactory description of local institutions. It is scarcely surprising that in covering so great an amount of ground, he has been guilty of faults both of omission and commission. Thus in his treatment of the local governmental institutions of England, he fails to lay sufficient emphasis upon the administrative control which has been adopted as a result of the new system of local administration inaugurated by the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, and developed in various subsequent acts. On page 147 of Volume I, he seems to have forgotten that the Local Government Act of 1888 still provides for a governmental certificate of efficiency in order that the subsidies granted by the central government may be distributed by the new county councils. Again, on page 148, he says that "the local authorities are almost free from central control, with the exception of the school board and the sanitary authorities and some others." As a matter of fact, there is probably no country where the central administrative control over matters of central interest is stronger than it is at the present time in England. Again, in speaking of the annual budget of Prussia, and of the necessity of the annual vote of taxes, he forgets that Article 109 of the Prussian constitution, to which he makes no reference, provides that in case of disagreement between the crown and parliament, the taxes shall continue to be levied in accordance with the provisions of the permanent law by which they are established.

In regard to the United States government, he has made a serious mistake where he says that the President of the United States is, like any other officer, responsible before the courts (II, 46). As a matter of fact, the United States courts have, in several instances, either strongly intimated or positively held that the President of the United States is, during his presidential term, free from any judicial control; that the only control in our system of government which may be exercised over the president is that provided for by the power granted to the House of Representatives to impeach him, and that given to the Senate to convict him on impeachment. Such mistakes as these are not numerous, however, when the immense amount of work which M. Dupriez has done is considered, and they do not detract very largely from the value of the book.

As a rule, the style is clear and attractive, and the author has taken considerable pains, in various parts of his work, to sum up the result of his study. Perhaps no better example of this could be given than his analysis of the position of the Italian ministry. He says:

The Italian ministry has evidently not fulfilled efficiently the triple mission of the parliamentary cabinet. It exercises the executive power in the name and under the authority of the king, but it does not always know how to keep the parliament within the limits of its legitimate control, and is obliged to submit to the interference of deputies in administration. It starts the work of the legislative power by the exercise of the right of initiation, and by the intervention of the ministers in the work of parliament, but it often does not possess the necessary authority to bring to a successful issue the reforms which it has undertaken, and the parliament escapes easily from its direction. It attempts to maintain harmony between the two powers, but the repeated checks which it has suffered show how much the work is hindered by the disorganization of parties. [I, 291.]

The author is perfectly impartial in his treatment of the subject, though he frankly indicates his preference for the government of the land in which he lives, and considers that Belgium has made the most happy application on the continent of the principles of parliamentary government. At the same time he acknowledges as frankly that every government must be adapted to the manners and habits of the people, and recognizes as well that what may appear to be a fault from the point of view of pure theory, may be so modified by the peculiar habits and customs of the people of a country as to lead to no evil results. These points are brought out particularly in the concluding remarks, to which reference has already been made. Nothing that he says will give a better idea of his attitude of mind than his comparison of the institutions of the United States and Switzerland:

A consideration of the system of separation of powers and of that of the confusion of powers, if combined with nothing else, would lead one to believe that the former must result in a complete paralysis of the political mechanism, while the other must bring absolutism and the ruin of liberty; nevertheless, the American government has been able to continue more than a century without too great a shock and too sudden a stoppage, while the Swiss institutions have generally given satisfactory results. . . . We believe that we must recognize that the traditions and political education of the people, when combined with happy circumstances, may be sufficient to prevent the dangers of institutions poorly organized, and may supplement their defects and even guarantee to them a permanent success.

I can recommend all who are interested in the study of political science to read carefully the volumes which M. Dupriez has put forth.

F. J. GOODNOW.